



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/068,816	02/05/2002	Felix G.T.I. Andrew	MSFT-1210(126608.2)	2569
7590	08/22/2007		EXAMINER	
Woodcock Washburn LLP 46th Floor One Liberty Place Philadelphia, PA 19103			STRANGE, AARON N	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2153		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/22/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/068,816	ANDREW ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Aaron Strange	2153

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 June 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-15 and 17-20 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-15 and 17-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The Examiner would like to note that the present application has been reassigned to a new Examiner.

Response to Amendment

2. Applicant's amendments are sufficient to overcome the rejection of claims 1-15 and 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Those rejection have been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration of the amended claims, new grounds of rejection have been presented in view of Scherbier, set forth below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-9, 11, 13-15 and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Scherbier (US 5,944,791).

5. With regard to claim 1, Scherbier discloses a server comprising:

a communications interface to a communications network for establishing a host communications link between the server (server web site 12) and a host client computer (pilot computer 18) and at least one slave communications link between the server and at least one slave client computer (passenger computer 26) (each computer connects to the internet to communicate)(col. 3, ll. 59 to col. 4, ll. 1); and

a shared view engine (control module 16) for storing a list associated with the host client computer (passenger list), the list comprising at least one identifier each identifying a respective slave client computer (each passenger sends the control module their identification)(col. 5, ll. 16-17), the shared view engine further for receiving, via the host communications link from the host client computer, a single content request comprising a locator (URL) corresponding to content on the server (pilot requests content from the server)(col. 5, ll. 36-38), and for causing the server, in response to the single content request, to concurrently deliver via the communications interface to the host client computer and to each slave client computer the content corresponding to the locator (the requested page is sent to both the pilot and passenger computers)(col. 6, ll. 4-7).

6. With regard to claim 2, Scherbier further discloses that the server is a Web Server, the content is a Web page, and the locator is a Universal Resource Locator (URL) corresponding to the Web page (col. 5, ll. 36-42).

7. With regard to claim 3, Scherbier further discloses that the communications interface enables the server computer to establish the host communications link and each slave communications link to any of a plurality of client computers on the communications network (all computers communicate via the Internet)(col. 3, ll. 59 to col 4, ll. 1).

8. With regard to claim 4, Scherbier further discloses that the shared view engine is further for receiving from the host client computer cookie data associated with the content (cookie is sent to control module with web page requests) (col. 4, ll. 50-60).

9. With regard to claim 5, Scherbier further discloses that the shared view engine determines from the received cookie data whether to download the content to the host client computer and to each slave client computer (flight will only occur if the pilot ID in the cookie is valid)(col. 4, ll. 50-60).

10. With regard to claim 6, Scherbier further discloses that the communications interface is further for establishing a respective slave communications link to each of a plurality of slave client computers, and wherein the shared view engine is further for causing the server to deliver via the respective slave communications links to the plurality of slave client computers the content corresponding to the locator such that the host client computer and the plurality of slave client computers are enabled to share

browsing of the content received from the server (from a single request by the pilot computer, all computers receive the same content) (col. 5, ll. 36 to col. 6, ll. 7).

11. With regard to claim 7, Scherbier further discloses that the communications interface is for establishing each slave communications link based on a respective identifier (col. 4, ll. 58-60; col. 5, ll. 16-17).

12. With regard to claim 8, Scherbier further discloses that the shared view engine receives the locator from a browser residing on the host client computer (col. 3, ll. 59-62; col. 5, ll. 36-38).

13. With regard to claims 9 and 11, Scherbier further discloses that the communications network is the Internet, which is a WAN (col. 3, ll. 59-62).

14. Claims 13-15 and 17-20 are rejected under the same rationale as claims 1-9 and 11, since they recite substantially identical subject matter. Any differences between the claims do not result in patentably distinct claims and all of the limitations are taught by the above cited art.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

15. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2153

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

16. Claims 10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scherbier (US 5,944,791) in view of Official Notice.

17. With regard to claims 10 and 12, while the system disclosed by Scherbier shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to specifically disclose that the communications network is an intranet or LAN.

The Examiner takes Official Notice that use of web servers on intranets and LANs is old and well known in the art. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been well aware of intranets and LANs and would have immediately recognized that Scherbier's system would easily be implemented on them as well.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the collaborative web browsing system on an intranet or LAN to allow users of those networks to share their browsing sessions.

Conclusion

18. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

19. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aaron Strange whose telephone number is 571-272-3959. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glen Burgess can be reached on 571-272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AS
8/17/07



GLENTON B. BURGESS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100